



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,583	08/30/2001	Jon Dakss	WMI-004 (8415/20)	9663
23363	7590	03/09/2006	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP			HOSSAIN, FARZANA E	
PO BOX 7068			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			2617	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/943,583	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DAKSS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Farzana E. Hossain	<b>Art Unit</b> 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5-13-04, 1-07-02, 8-16-05, 9-27-04, 6-8-04</u>                            | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |
|  | <u>1-20-04</u>  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement filed 1-11-02, 5-13-04 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 2 of the claim recites "fame." The Office assumes "fame" to be --frame--. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claim 1, 4-6, 13-17, 32-35, 38-40, 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shoff et al (US 6,240,555 and hereafter referred to as "Shoff") is incorporated by reference in its entirety.

Regarding Claim 1, Shoff discloses a hyperlinked broadcast system (Figure 4, 60), a continuous media server or video source (Figure 2, 42, Figure 4, 42) provides video information or programs (Figure 2, 40, Figure 4, 40) or another source such as satellite feed or another cable system (Column 5, lines 1-3), an enhanced content server or annotation system (Figure 2, 52, Figure 4, 52) generating supplemental content or annotation data with the video information or programs (Column 5, lines 12-23, Column 12, lines 39-43) and generating timing information for synchronization of the program (Column 9, lines 66-67, Column 10, lines 1-17, Figure 6, 176, Figure 7, 182, Column 12, lines 43-47), an author constructing a target resource with target specification including the program, the supplemental content, and synchronization data combining them into a signal to be transmitted to the user (Column 12, lines 39-67, Column 14, lines 31-41), which would necessarily include the author receiving annotation data or supplemental content, video information or program information, and timing data of the program to synchronize the supplemental content into a an augmented video transmission signal or an augmented video information transmission generator associates the program with the supplemental content using timing or synchronization information (Column 12, lines 39-67, Column 14, lines 31-41).

Regarding Claim 32, Shoff discloses a hyperlinked reception system comprising: a receiver or viewing computing unit in communication with a network or broadcast

channel to the headend (Figure 2, 26, Figure 4, 68) which produces a signal with video information and supplemental content (Figure 6, Figure 7, 182); and a display device in communication with the viewing computing unit (Figure 2, 26, Figure 4, 66), and the receiver receives synchronized mask data or supplemental content with the video information on a frame by frame basis or frame numbers in response to the timing information or requirements (Column 10, lines 7-17, Figure 6, 176).

Regarding Claim 35, Shoff discloses a method of generating a hyperlinked video signal (Figure 2, Figure 4) comprising generating annotation data or supplemental content time information from video information or timing requirements for supplemental content for a movie or program (Column 12, lines 39-47); generating annotation data or supplement content for the video information or program (Column 12, lines 41-43); communicating the timing information or requirements, the supplemental content and the program in order to create a signal by an author, which would necessarily include an augmented video information transmission generator as the signal is being combined to be sent (Figure 2, Figure 4) and synchronizing the program with the supplemental content in response to the timing requirements from the author (Column 12, lines 39-47).

Regarding Claims 4, 34 and 38, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claims 1, 32 and 35 respectively. Shoff discloses that the timing information comprises at least one of frame number information (Column 10, lines 14-17).

Regarding Claims 5 and 39, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claims 1 and 35 respectively. Shoff discloses the programs comprise digital video signal (Column 5, lines 4-5).

Regarding Claims 6 and 40, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claims 1 and 35 respectively. Shoff discloses the programs comprise analog video signal (Column 5, lines 4-5).

Regarding Claim 13, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Shoff discloses a receiver or viewing computing unit in communication with a network or broadcast channel to the headend (Figure 2, 26, Figure 4, 68) which produces a signal with video information and supplemental content (Figure 6, Figure 7, 182); and a display device in communication with the viewing computing unit (Figure 2, 26, Figure 4, 66), and the receiver receives synchronized mask data or supplemental content with the video information on a frame by frame basis or frame numbers in response to the timing information or requirements (Column 10, lines 7-17, Figure 6, 176).

Regarding Claim 14, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claim 13. Shoff discloses that the display device displays the annotation data in response to a viewer request or the viewer has a displayed screen which allows the viewer to click on various buttons or URLs to see the timelinked contextual information including playing games and details about actors (Column 11, lines 20-24, Figures 8a, 8b, 8c)

Regarding Claims 15 and 44, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claims 1 and 35 respectively. Shoff discloses that the supplemental content comprises at least one of a mask data or supplemental content that is synchronized to the program (Column

10, lines 7-9), textual data or text (Column 5, lines 16-18) and graphics data or graphics (Column 5, lines 16-18).

Regarding Claims 16 and 45, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claims 15 and 44 respectively. Shoff discloses that the mask data or supplemental content comprises at least one of a graphics presentation and a textual presentation (Column 5, lines 16-18).

Regarding Claims 17 and 46, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claims 15 and 44 respectively. Shoff discloses that the mask data or supplemental content comprises location information of an object in an annotated video frame or location of the supplemental content based on the display format (Column 10, lines 44-50).

Regarding Claim 33, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claim 32. Shoff discloses that the receiver or viewing computing unit comprises a way to measure timer in the program to synchronize the supplemental content or mask data to the associated program, which reads on a timer to calculate an offset of the timing information (Column 10, lines 7-15).

5. Claims 22-25, 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Srinivasan et al (US 6,357,042 and hereafter referred to as "Srinivasan").

Regarding Claim 22, Srinivasan discloses a hyperlinked transmission assembly system (Figure 1, Figure 8, Figure 10): an annotation data stream generator capable of accessing annotation data (Figure 1, 11), a video information source providing video information or the video head end providing video data (Figure 1, 12, 15), a frame

reader/counter module (Figure 10, 97) which is in communication with the video source as it is receiving video data and annotation data stream generator as it receives the associated annotation stream, the frame reader/counter module adapts the annotation stream and video stream by counting the frames of the video data to associate the frames of a video stream with the annotation stream, which reads on extracting the timing information from the video data (Column 18, lines 22-35), an augmented or combined video information transmission generator or writer/data inserter in communication with the annotation stream generator or authoring system and the video information source to synchronize the video with the annotation data based on the timing information (Column 18, lines 22-35, 48-60, Column 19, lines 48-60).

Regarding Claim 23, Srinivasan discloses all the limitations of Claim 22.

Srinivasan discloses that the frame reader/counter module synchronizes the video data with the annotation stream on a frame-by-frame basis (Column 18, lines 22-35, 48-60, Column 19, lines 48-60).

Regarding Claim 24, Srinivasan discloses all the limitations of Claim 22.

Srinivasan discloses that the annotation data timing information decoder or the frame reader/counter module inserter counts the frames in the video stream for synchronization and then inserts the stream denoting the frames in to the video blanking interval or vertical blanking interval (VBI) so that the frame reader/counter module reads on a VBI decoder (Column 18, lines 48-60).

Regarding Claim 25, Srinivasan discloses all the limitations of Claim 22.

Srinivasan discloses that the annotation data timing information decoder or the frame



reader/counter module inserter counts the frames in the video stream for synchronization and then inserts the stream denoting the frames in to the video blanking interval or vertical blanking interval (VBI) so that the frame reader/counter module reads on a VBI decoder or a vertical ancillary data decoder (Column 18, lines 48-60).

Regarding Claim 29, Srinivasan discloses all the limitations of Claim 22. Srinivasan discloses that the authoring system streams the annotation data that is associated with the video program based on the timing information which is used to synchronize the annotation stream to the video data (Column 18, lines 22-35, 48-60, Column 19, lines 48-60).

Regarding Claim 30, Srinivasan discloses all the limitations of Claim 22. Srinivasan discloses that the annotation data timing information comprises timestamp information (Column 28, lines 61-63), time code information (Column 18, lines 22-35), and frame number information (Column 18, lines 22-35).

Regarding Claim 31, Srinivasan discloses all the limitations of Claim 22. Srinivasan discloses that the annotation data comprises one of a mask data or annotation data that is synchronized to the video data (Column 6, lines 1-20) and textual data (Column 6, lines 8-10).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2, 36, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoff in view of Hidary et al (US 5,774,664 and hereafter referred to as "Hidary").

Regarding Claims 2 and 36, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claims 1 and 35 respectively. Shoff is silent on the generator comprising a vertical blanking interval insertion device. Hidary discloses that a system providing videos (Figure 1, 4) and then augmenting the annotated data or supplemental content or URLs (Figure 1, 8) to transmit to a viewer (Figure 1, 12). Hidary discloses that the augmented video information transmission generator is a VBI insertion device (Column 4, lines 40-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shoff to include augmented video information transmission generator is a VBI insertion device (Column 4, lines 40-55) as taught by Hidary in order to provide a user friendly visual experience of television programming to a viewer (Column 1, lines 53-62) as disclosed by Hidary.

Regarding Claim 41, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claim 35. Shoff is silent the insertion of timing information in the VBI. Hidary discloses that a system providing videos (Figure 1, 4) and then augmenting the annotated data or supplemental content or URLs (Figure 1, 8) to transmit to a viewer (Figure 1, 12). Hidary discloses that the inserting URLs with timing information or time stamps in the VBI of an analog signal (Column 4, lines 36-37, 40-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shoff to include inserting timing information or time stamps in the VBI of an analog signal (Column 4, lines 36, 37,

40-55) as taught by Hidary in order to provide a user friendly visual experience of television programming to a viewer (Column 1, lines 53-62) as disclosed by Hidary.

8. Claims 3 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoff in view of Eyer et al (US 5,982,445 and hereafter referred to as "Eyer").

Regarding Claims 3 and 37, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claims 1 and 35 respectively. Shoff discloses that the supplemental content and the video information can be a combined signal or two separate signals. Shoff is however silent on a multiplexer. Eyer discloses a system with programming services or video (Figure 1, 100) and annotation data or URL (Column 6, lines 18-24) to a multiplexer or a digital video data multiplexer (Figure 1, 115, Column 7, lines 59-67, Column 8, lines 1-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shoff to include a multiplexer or a digital video data multiplexer to combine the annotated data to the video program (Figure 1, 115, Column 7, lines 59-67, Column 8, lines 1-10) as taught by Eyer in order to provide viewers with additional information for educational and entertainment purposes (Column 4, lines 1-5) as disclosed by Eyer.

9. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoff in view of Travaille et al (US 6067107 and hereafter referred to as "Travaille").

Regarding Claims 7 and 10, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Shoff discloses a post production environment or centralized headend (Figure 2, 22), a

Art Unit: 2617

broadcast network (Column 4, lines 43-50), and the centralized headend combines video data and synchronized timing data and transmits to a headend or node (Column 4, lines 43-50). Shoff discloses that the centralized headend has an author who synchronized the supplemental content to the program (Column 12, lines 39-47); the supplemental content and program can be a combined signal leaving the centralized headend or two separate signals (Column 10, lines 18-22). Shoff is silent on the regional node comprising the augmented video information transmission generator. Travaille discloses a broadcaster that provides program information (Figure 1, 114) and broadcast server provides interactive applications (Figure 1, 110, 112). Travaille discloses that the program and interactive applications are transmitted to a data insertion unit or node in order to combine the two signals via insertion into the VBI of the programming signal (Figure 1, 117) to be transmitted to the viewer (Figure 1, 120), which reads on the headend comprising the augmented video information transmission generator. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shoff to include that the program and interactive applications are transmitted to a data insertion unit or node in order to combine the two signals or the headend the augmented video information transmission generator (Figure 1, 117) as taught by Travaille in order to manage the interactive responses received by the interactive programs (Column 1, lines 28-31) as disclosed by Travaille.

Regarding Claims 8 and 11, Shoff and Travaille disclose all the limitations of Claim 7 and 10. Shoff discloses that the node is a cable headend (Column 4, lines 45-52).

Regarding Claims 9 and 12, Shoff and Travaille disclose all the limitations of Claim 7 and 10. Shoff discloses that the node is a satellite headend (Column 4, lines 45-52).

10. Claims 18-20, 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoff in view of Srinivasan.

Regarding Claims 18 and 47, Shoff discloses all the limitations of claims 17 and 46 respectively. Shoff is silent on location reference representing a fixed relation to a set of pixels. Srinivasan discloses a system with a video source (Figure 1, 12, 15) to an authoring system (Figure 1, 11) with annotated streams and video data are combined by synchronization (Figure 1, 21). Srinivasan discloses that location reference represent a fixed relation to a set of pixels associated with an object for instance a swim suit worn by diver in a video is the object and the swim suit is tracked with the pixels (Column 8, lines 1-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shoff to include the that location reference represent a fixed relation to a set of pixels associated with an object for instance a swim suit worn by diver in a video is the object and the swim suit is tracked with the pixels (Column 8, lines 1-33) as taught by Srinivasan in order to coordinate video data with related information (Column 1, lines 27-20, 34-50) as disclosed by Srinivasan.

Regarding Claims 19 and 48, Shoff and Srinivasan disclose all the limitations of claims 18 and 47 respectively. Srinivasan discloses that there are a group of target

Art Unit: 2617

pixels based on a tracking box and object (Figure 2, 29). Therefore, it is necessarily included that the pixels include the upper left most pixel in the associated pixel set if the object that is being tracked is located at the upper most left corner (Figure 2, Figure 3).

Regarding Claims 20 and 49, Shoff and Srinivasan disclose all the limitations of claims 18 and 48 respectively. Srinivasan discloses that there are a group of target pixels based on a tracking box and object (Figure 2 and Figure 3), if the object is in the center position then the centroid pixel is in the associated pixel set (Figure 2, 29). Therefore, it is necessarily included that the pixels include the centroid pixel in the associated pixel set.

11. Claims 21, 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoff in view of Wistendahl et al (US 6,496,981 and hereafter referred to as "Wistendahl")

Regarding Claims 21 and 50, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claims 15 and 44 respectively. Shoff discloses that the mask data comprises location information about an object in a video frame to be annotated or supplemental content to be added to video (Column 10, lines 44-47). Shoff is silent on the mask data comprising shape information of an object. Wistendahl discloses a system that has a movie or video program (Figure 1, 10) and a frame with an object, the object can be clicked on to provide further information via a hot spot (Column 6, lines 17-26). Wistendahl discloses that location and shape information of an object in the video frame (Column 10, lines 8-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was

made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shoff to include the that location and shape information of an object in the video frame (Column 10, lines 8-35) as taught by Wistendahl in order to use media content for interactive television (Column 1, lines 12-14, 45-67) as disclosed by Wistendahl.

Regarding Claim 51, Shoff and Wistendahl disclose all the limitations of Claim 50. Wistendahl discloses the shape information is represented by a hyper link (Column 10, lines 36-56). The hyperlink can be a graphical overlay of the object (Column 9, lines 28-33).

Regarding Claim 52, Shoff and Wistendahl disclose all the limitations of Claim 50. Wistendahl discloses the shape information is represented by an outline of the object (Column 10, lines 25-28).

12. Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of Shoff.

Regarding Claim 26, Srinivasan discloses all the limitations of Claim 22. Srinivasan discloses that the timing information or frame number is counted by the frame reader/counter from the video data (Column 18, lines 22-35) and accesses the annotation stream provided by the authoring system as soon as the timing information is read or counted (Column 18, lines 22-35). Srinivasan is silent on the storage device. Shoff discloses a system which has a video source providing video program (Figure 2, 40, Figure 4, 40) and an annotation data stream generator or enhanced content server (Figure 2, 52, Figure 4, 52) which are augmented or combined to a single signal due to

synchronizing the supplemental content to the program (Column 12, lines 39-67, Column 14, lines 31-41). Shoff discloses that the designer of the presentation of interactive material uses synchronization information to combine or augment supplemental content from the supplemental content storage device to the video content (Figure 2, 54, Figure 4, 54). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Srinivasan to include the annotation data stream generator accesses the annotation data from an internal storage device (Figure 2, 54, Figure 4, 54) as taught by Shoff in order to enable viewer interactively with video program (Column 1, lines 8-14) as disclosed by Shoff.

Regarding Claim 27, Srinivasan discloses all the limitations of Claim 22. Srinivasan is silent on the storage device. Shoff discloses a system, which has a video source providing video program (Figure 2, 40, Figure 4, 40) and an annotation data stream generator or enhanced content server (Figure 2, 52, Figure 4, 52), which are augmented or combined to a single signal due to synchronizing the supplemental content to the program (Figure 4, 74). Shoff discloses that the annotation data stream generator accesses the annotation data from an internal storage device (Figure 2, 54, Figure 4, 54). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Srinivasan to include the annotation data stream generator accesses the annotation data from an internal storage device (Figure 2, 54, Figure 4, 54) as taught by Shoff in order to enable viewer interactively with video program (Column 1, lines 8-14) as disclosed by Shoff.



Art Unit: 2617

13. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of Purnaveja et al (US 6,006,241 and hereafter referred to as "Purna").

Regarding Claim 28, Srinivasan discloses all the limitations of Claim 22.

Srinivasan is silent on the external storage. Purna discloses a producer at a production station of annotation streams that defines the contents on display for the user (Figure 2, 210, 215) and web server provides annotation data (Figure 2, 230). Purna discloses that the production station or annotation data stream generator accesses annotation data from an external storage device or web server for textual/graphical inform such as a web page (Column 5, lines 43-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Srinivasan to include that annotation data stream generator accesses annotation data from an external storage device or web server for textual/graphical inform such as a web page (Column 5, lines 43-53) as taught by Purna in order to delivery annotated multimedia streams over a diverse network while using network resources efficiently (Column 1, lines 64-67, Column 2, lines 27-33) as disclosed by Purna.

14. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoff in view of Oguro et al (US 2001/0033739 and hereafter referred to as "Oguro") and Hidary.

Regarding Claim 42, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claim 35. Shoff is silent the insertion of timing information in the vertical ancillary data or VBI. Oguro discloses a television broadcast system, which transmits digital video signals to the user (Page 5,

paragraph 0077) and inserts data into the VBI of a digital video signal (Page 5, paragraph 0076). Hidary discloses that a system providing videos (Figure 1, 4) and then augmenting the annotated data or supplemental content or URLs (Figure 1, 8) to transmit to a viewer (Figure 1, 12). Hidary discloses that the inserting URLs with timing information or time stamps in the VBI of a digital video signal (Column 4, lines 36-37, 40-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shoff to include inserting information in the VBI of a digital video signal (Page 5, paragraph 0076) as taught by Oguro in order to provide copy protect television broadcast programs (Page 1, paragraphs 0001, 0006) as disclosed by Oguro. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shoff to include inserting timing information or time stamps in the VBI (Column 4, lines 36, 37, 40-55) as taught by Hidary in order to provide a user friendly visual experience of television programming to a viewer (Column 1, lines 53-62) as disclosed by Hidary.

15. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoff in view of Purna.

Regarding Claim 43, Shoff discloses all the limitations of Claim 35. Shoff is silent on the transmitting the timing information and video information to a broadcast network and subsequently to the augmented video transmission generator. Purna discloses a producer at a production station of annotation streams that defines the contents on display for the user (Figure 2, 210, 215) and web server provides annotation data

Art Unit: 2617

(Figure 2, 230). Purna discloses that the production station or annotation data stream generator provides the timing information or time stamps (Column 7, lines 20-27) with the video information to the stream server or the augmented video information transmission generator (Column 7, lines 58-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shoff to include that production station or annotation data stream generator provides the timing information or time stamps (Column 7, lines 20-27) with the video information to the stream server or the augmented video information transmission generator (Column 7, lines 58-64) as taught by Purna in order to delivery annotated multimedia streams over a diverse network while using network resources efficiently (Column 1, lines 64-67, Column 2, lines 27-33) as disclosed by Purna.

### ***Conclusion***

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Michaud et al (US 2002/0052891 and hereafter referred to as "Michaud").

Michaud discloses a system with an image that can have a shape highlighted for hyperlinking (Pages 1-2, paragraph 0015).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farzana E. Hossain whose telephone number is 571-

Art Unit: 2617

272-5943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FEH  
February 21, 2006



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER